

widower, *n.*, hne bo.

wife, *n.*, paya.

wind, *n.*, k̄li.

wink, *v.*, amik che pek u.

wipe, *v.*, hō u.

wish, *v.*, woī u.

with, *post. pos.*, ung. N. yung.

within, *post. pos.*, dük a. N. dú-gá-mé.

woman, *n.*, hnato.

wood, *n.*, htěn sho.

word, *n.*, pau.

work, *n.*, asei.

wrist, *n.*, maḡuht-piām.

### Y.

yam, *n.*, ahá. N. ba-há.

yawn, *v.*, han u.

yellow, *adj.*, aoi.

ye, *pron.*, naun hni (dual) ; naun me (plur.). N. náng-ni.

yes, ö ; ö ö ; shi ba. N. a-hi. [*Compare* hi, *v.*, to ask.]

yesterday, *n.*, yand a. N. yam-tu.

yet, *conj.*, hon.

you, *pron.*, naun hni, nahói (dual) ; naun me, nahio (plural).

young, *adj.* amlék ; ašo.

youth, *n.*, khlaung zo ; son biän.

*On a Coin of Kunanda from Karnál.—By BA'BU RA'JENDRALA'LA MITRA.*

(With a woodcut.)

The mintage of which the woodcut at the end of this article is a representation is well known to Indian numismatists. It has been noticed by Prinsep, Wilson, Cunningham, and others ; and in a learned essay in the first volume of the New Series of the Royal Asiatic Society's Journal (pp. 447 ff.), Mr. Thomas has described it at great length and in full detail. There are, however, a few points in connexion with it which the uncommonly fine specimen presented to the Society by the Rev. M. M. Carleton of Karnál enables me to explain with some confidence.

In all essential particulars, Mr. Carleton's specimen is identically the same as the British Museum one figured by Mr. Thomas. It has on the obverse the curiously-antlered deer, the lady with a lotus, the square monogram, and the Western Cave character legend, so graphically described by Mr. Thomas, and all the Buddhist symbols, and the Bactrian or Ariano-Páli legend, noticed by him on the reverse of the British Museum specimen. The size is exactly the same, and the configuration of the symbols is identical, except of the rectangular monogram, the cross line in the middle of which is very faint and scarcely visible. The style of some of the old Sanskrit characters in which the Páli legend is given, is, however, different, and it proves the coin before me to have been struck from a different die from what was used for the British Museum specimen. Owing to its better state of preservation, its weight, too, is greater, being 34·1 grains against 29 grains of the other.

The differences in the letters of the obverse legend are not numerous, but they are well-marked and unmistakable. The first letter in the British Museum specimen is shaped somewhat like an English s, whereas in the specimen before me it is clearly like the English j; it is, however, in either case intended to stand for the Sanskrit  $\text{र} = r$ . The second letter in the former specimen, is a compound of j and  $\text{॒}$  followed by a visarga, the Sanskrit  $\text{ऋ} = \text{॒} \text{॒} \text{॒} \text{॒}$ ,—the j taking the full depth of the line with the visarga after it, and the  $\text{॒}$  hanging down below it. In the latter the  $\text{॒}$  occupies the place of the j in the body of the line, and the j, if it ever existed, must have stood above the line, and is lost by the want of space in the margin. The visarga occurs after the  $\text{॒}$ . In the former case the word has to be read *rájñah*, the genitive singular of *rájan*—‘of a king’, and in the latter, if the assumption of a j over the  $\text{॒}$  be not admitted, *rañah* the type of the modern *ráníá*, ‘a king’. The name which follows being in the genitive, the epithet should also be in the same case, and so I have no doubt that when the margin of the coin was perfect, there was a j over the line just above the  $\text{॒}$ , and the word was *rájñah*, the genitive of *rájan*, as in Mr. Thomas’s specimen.

In the second word, the nasal mark (*anusvara*) after the  $\text{॒}$  is absent in the British Museum specimen as figured by Mr. Thomas, but it is distinct in Mr. Carleton’s coin.

The first half of the third word is identical in both, but the second half in the specimen before me is clearly *bhatisa*, and not *bhatasa* as shown in Mr. Thomas’s figure, nor *bhratasa* as it has been read by that gentleman.

In the last word *maharajasa*, the r is formed of a perpendicular stroke like an I, and not a stroke with a curled tail like J, as in the first word and in the British Museum specimen. The  $\text{॒} = j$  is also slightly different, being more like the Greek  $\Sigma$  than the English  $\text{E}$ , as in the latter.

Adverting to the reading of the second word, Mr. Thomas says: “The monarch’s name on this series of coins has hitherto, by common consent, been transcribed as Kunanda, and tested by the more strict laws of its own system of Palæography, the initial compound, in Indian Páli, would preferentially represent the letters *ku*. There can be little doubt, the true normal form of the short u ( $\text{L}$ ), which can be traced downwards in its consistent modifications in most of the Western Inscriptions, though the progressive Gangetic mutations completely reversed the lower stroke of their u ( $\text{॒}$ ). The question of the correct reading of the designation has, however, been definitively set at rest by the Bactrian counterpart legends on the better preserved specimens of the coinage, where the initial combination figures as *kr*, a transliteration which any more close and critical examination of the rest of the Indian Páli legend would, of itself, have suggested, in the parallel use of the same subjunct  $\text{L}$  in  $\text{अन ब्रता}$ .”\*

\* Journal, R. As. Soc., N. S., I, p. 476.

This argument, however, is not conclusive, as Mr. Carleton's coin is as well preserved as any I have seen of so old a date as three hundred and twenty-five to three hundred and forty years before Christ, every letter being perfectly distinct and as sharp as when first issued from the mint, and in it the lower limb of the Bactrian k of the reverse is perfectly straight and blunt, showing not the smallest trace of a spur or curl to the right. And even with the curl, the indication is not so decisive as could be wished, for a very slight bend in the foot often occurs in this class of writing without meaning any consonantal or vowel affix. It is the result of hasty writing, in which the pen is not taken off the paper before it has already produced a tail. It was this tail which changed the original Indian † successively into † † † †. In the Ariano-Páli character several instances may be easily cited in ancient inscriptions, where the lower limb, although ordinarily straight, has sometimes been curled or spurred. Thus the *ch*, ordinarily written  $\zeta$ , is sometimes provided with a spur, thus  $\Sigma$ .\* The spur is again used for u, as in  $\angle$ , which Professor Dowson takes for *mu*, and also for y, as in  $\Sigma$ , which the same gentleman takes for *syā*.† Adverting to this curl in the Baháwalpur inscription, he further says: "It proves, however, that the curl of the foot of a consonant indicates that consonant to be doubled, and not to be always, as hitherto supposed, a consonant combined with r. From the frequent combination of r with other consonants in Sanskrit, this twist of the bottom of a letter represents the letter more frequently than any other; but as we here find the s curled round to represent the sy of the Sanskrit genitive, there can be no doubt it represents the doubled consonant—that doubled consonant being here the equivalent of sy. In most other instances, as in Achayya for Achárya, it is the equivalent of r combined with another consonant. This substitution of doubled for compound consonants brings the language into much closer relation with the Páli‡." It should be remarked, however, that this inference, ingenious as it is, is redundant; for the language of the inscription being the old Páli of the Kapurdigiri monument, the genitive should require no y after s, and the curl may pass for an ornament or a variant form as in the case of *ch* noticed by him, and referred to above.

Epigraphic evidence being thus far unsatisfactory and inconclusive, though from the more frequent occurrence of the spur to the right for r in the Bactrian Mr. Thomas's reading is the most consistent, it is necessary to turn our attention next to the etymology of the word, not with any great hope of a decisive result, for the ductility and plasticity of the Sanskrit language are quite against such an expectation, but only to see on which side

\* Journal, R. As. Soc., XX., plate IV.

† Loc. cit.

‡ Ibid., N. S., IV., p. 501.

the balance of evidence inclines most. The aptote noun *ku* in Sanskrit and its affiliated languages is a particle of depreciation, implying 'low', 'vile', 'bad', 'wrong', &c.,\* and it might at first sight appear improbable that it should be used as a prefix to a royal name; but, seeing that in India such depreciatory particles are deliberately adopted by Hindu parents to avert evils and for other causes, the objection may be set aside as of no weight. *Tinkori*, "three cowri shells," *Páñchkori* "five cowri shells," *Sátkori* "seven cowri shells," *Nakori*, "nine cowri shells," and similar other terms, all meaning 'worthless', are extensively used as proper names, in order that no evil eye may rest on the children to whom they are assigned, and the children may be allowed to thrive without exciting envy, malice, or jealousy. *Bhuto* "blacky," *Khonrá*, "lame," *Nulo* "weak-handed", and the like,† are also of frequent occurrence as proper names. An accident or misfortune happening on the day of a babe's birth is also often memorialized by assigning a bad name to the newcomer, and such nicknames, like any other mud, stick, and cannot be shaken off. Again, the horoscope of a babe might indicate that he would in after life be evilly disposed, and this may likewise influence the choice of a name for him. And any of these facts may easily be assumed to account for the use of an offensive prefix like *ku* in the name in question.

No assumption of the kind, however, is necessary in the present case. As a common noun *ku* means 'the earth', and joined to *nanda*, it would mean the "earth's delight", a very appropriate name for a lad, whether a prince or otherwise. No fond mother could wish for a better name for her young hopeful.

If we take the first syllable of the name to be *kra*, we must look for its root in *kri*, which means, 'to do,' 'to make,' 'to perform any action,' or 'to hurt,' 'to injure' or to 'kill'. Added to *nanda* it would mean the promoter, or destroyer, of delight, and the former would unquestionably make a very appropriate proper name. But if we accept *kri* to be the root, its participial form should follow the word *nanda*, and not precede it. Mr. Thomas says that the late Dr. Goldstücker was of opinion "that the *kra*, in combination with *Nanda*, may possibly stand for कृ *kri*, "a million", or some vague number corresponding with Mahápadma (100,000 millions), under the supposition that the latter designation was applied to one of the Nanda family, in its numerical sense, as a fabulous total, and not in the more usually received meaning of "a large lotus."‡

The learned doctor was doubtless a very conscientious worker and a

\* कुगतिप्रादयः ।२ २.१८ । Páṇini.

† When a person gets too many female children, the last not unfrequently gets the name of *Arná* "no more", to express the satiety of the parents.

‡ Journal, R. As. Soc., N. S., I., p. 476.

thorough scholar, and he may have somewhere found authority for the above; but I have not been able to find in any dictionary the word *kri* with the meaning of ‘a million’, and my friends among the Professors of the Sanskrit College of Calcutta have also failed to find out any authority for such a meaning. Professor Mahes’achandra Nyáyaratna authorises me to say there is no such meaning.

*Kra* is sometimes used in compounds as an onomatopoeic term for a clicking sound, as in *krakacha* for ‘a saw’, but it is of no value in the explanation of the word under notice. The root *kri* = क्री “to buy” with the affix *क* would make *kra* “a purchaser”, and it added to *nanda* would mean “the delighter of buyers”, but such a term for a royal proper name is as unlikely as possible. Thus then, on the one hand, palæographic evidence is not positively in favour of the reading *kra*, etymology, on the other, is all but decidedly against it; and, seeing that in the Greek and Persian transcriptions of the name, as quoted by Mr. Thomas, the *r* has been dispensed with, I am disposed to think that the balance of evidence is in favour of the old reading.

The first half of the third word is identically the same in the Páli legend of Mr. Thomas’s figure and Mr. Carleton’s coin, and can be read only as *amagha*. The Bactrian version of the latter has also the same reading. In the Bactrian version of the former there is, however, a spur under the *m*, which must be read, and has been very correctly read by Mr. Thomas as the equivalent to *o*, and not of *r*, as he takes the spur to be in the first syllable of the second word. It is well known that in the Páli, as in the modern Kuthiwál, the vowel marks were very much neglected (in the very coin before us *rájnah* is written *rajnah*, and *mahárájá*, *maharaja*), and there is no reason when the mark is given in one place why we should not supply it where it has been dropped. The reading therefore may be accepted unquestionably as *amogha*, meaning “unfailing” or “unflinching”. The first letter of the second half of the third word is *bha* in both the legends of Mr. Carleton’s coin and in the Páli legend of Mr. Thomas’s figure. The foot of the letter is perfectly straight, and there is not the slightest indication of any spur below it, nor sufficiently marked at the right end of the middle stroke to be taken into account. But in the Bactrian version of the latter there is a barely perceptible tendency to a curl which as in the case of the first syllable of the second word Mr. Thomas takes to be an *r*. The next two syllables are unquestionably and unmistakeably *ti* and *sa* in both the legends of Mr. Carleton’s coin and in the Bactrian version of Mr. Thomas’s figure, but *ta* and *sa* in the Páli version of the latter. Now, as superfluous addition of vowelmarks is not a peculiarity of the Páli, though omissions are, it must follow that the correct reading of the word is *bhatisa* or *bhratisa*, and not *bhratasa*.

The question then arises what does *bhatisa* or *bhratisa* mean? and the reply has already been given by Prinsep, Wilson, Cunningham, and Thomas, that it is equivalent to *bhratasa* "of a brother". But, notwithstanding the most profound veneration for the unanimous opinion of such high authorities, I cannot divest myself of a doubt as to its accuracy. The word *bhrátá* comes from the Sanskrit crude noun *bhrátri*, and is analogous to *pitá* from *pitri*, "father," *mátá* from *mátri*, "mother," *svasá* from *svasri*, "sister", and other words ending with the vowel *ri* in the crude form. Now, in all the European languages of Aryan origin the final *ri* of the Sanskrit is represented by *ar*, not *i* or *ri*. Thus, *pitri* becomes *πατήρ* in Greek, *pater* in Latin, *fator* in Old High German, *fader* in Anglo-Saxon, and *fader*, *fadar*, *vader*, *father*, &c., in others. In Persian it is *pidar*. *Mátri*, in the same way, becomes, Greek *μήτηρ*, Latin *mater*, Old English *moder*, Anglo-Saxon *modor*, Danish and Swedish *moder*, and *muotar*, *muatar*, *muter*, *mutter*, &c., in other languages. In Persian it is *mádar*. *Svasri* also becomes *suster*, *sustre*, *sostre*, *sweoster*, *swester*, *swyster*, *swistar*, *soror*, *sister*, &c., always changing the Sanskrit *ri* into *ar*, *er* or *or*, never into *i* or *ri*. In the Indian vernaculars *ri* when final changes into *á*, in the plural *ar*,\* and this was also the case in the Ariano-Páli, the Ceylonese Páli, and the Prákrits. These instances would fully justify the inference that *bhrátri* should change in the same way; and, as a matter of fact, we have for its counterparts in the Greek *φράτωρ*, Latin *frater*, French *frère*, Anglo-Saxon *brodhor*, Old High German *pruadar*, English *brother*, &c., &c., the change everywhere being analogous to what takes place in *pitri*, *mátri*, and *svasri*. In Páli and Prákrit it becomes *bhátá*. In the Taxila inscription line 4, we have *bhratara* in the plural,† in the Pesháwar Vase *bhraterhi*, plural,‡ and on the Wardak Vase *bhrátá* as read by me, and *bhadar* as read by Professor Dowson,§ everywhere the *ri* changing into *ar* or *á*, but nowhere into *i*. And as the coin legend is written in the same language in which the inscriptions are recorded, I venture to think that the assumption of the word in the coin (*bhrati* or *bhati*) being a Páli form of *bhrátri* quite inadmissible. There is not a tittle of evidence to support it.

Extraneous evidence on the subject is also against the assumption. I believe it is not usual with kings to pride themselves upon their being a brother to some one. In India the idea is particularly repugnant. An old Sanskrit adage says, "He is great who is known by his own name; he is so and so who is known by the name of his father; he is vile who is known

\* The Hindi *máyi* may at first sight appear an exception, but in reality it is not so, the final *i* in it being an honorific affix, and not the remnant of the Sanskrit *ri*. *Bháyi* in Bengali and Hindí are exceptions.

† Journal, R. As. Soc., XX., p. 223.

‡ Ibid., p. 241.

§ Ibid., p. 261.

by the name of his mother ; he is the lowest of the low who is known by the name of his father-in-law",\* and the action of men has everywhere in this country been regulated by this maxim. A brother holds a lower grade than a mother, and he who should wish to be known in his coins by the name of his brother, must have been lower than the vile being who is known by the name of his mother. Doubtless when a brother exercises paramount power, his name cannot be avoided, and Mr. Thomas very correctly argues that the fact of the Nanda brothers having ruled jointly may justify the assumption of Amogha having been the eldest brother, and his name had therefore to be used. This, however, would pre-suppose that the name of the eldest brother was well known, which is not the case. The Purāṅas and the Maháwanso give only three names, viz., Sumálya, Mahápadma Nanda, and Dhana Nanda. In a mediæval paraphrase, by Ananta-kavi, of the *Mudrárákshasa*, the nine brothers are thus named : Udagradhaṅva, Tikshṇadhanva, Vikāṭadhanva, Utkāṭadhanva, Prakaṭadhanva, Sankaṭadhanva, Vishamadhanva, Sikharadhanva, and Prakharadhanva.† These names are evidently fanciful, and cannot be relied upon. Anyhow no ancient or mediæval work mentions *Amogha*, and the assumption of *Amogha* being a proper name is founded solely upon the strength of the supposed meaning of the word *bhratara* 'a brother', with which it is compounded in the coin legend, and that being untenable, the assumption must fall to the ground. I have already pointed out that *amogha* as a common noun means 'unflinching' or 'unfailing'. Now, the most appropriate words that can be joined with it are valour, protection, and faith. The first, however, has no Sanskrit equivalent which can be represented by *bhratisa* or *bhatisa*, so it may be at once set aside. *Bhri* "to protect" becomes *bhartri* "protector" in the crude form, and *bhartá* in the nominative singular. In the Páli its counterpart would be *bhattá* or *bhatá*, (in the modern Bengali it is *bhátár* for 'a husband'), and had the reading been *bhatasa* or *bhratasa*, the compound term of the coin could have been taken for an "unfailing protector", but the mark of the i over the t will not admit of this interpretation. The last word 'faith' is represented in Sanskrit by *bhakti*, which in Ceylonese Páli becomes *bhatti* ;

\* खनासा पुरुषो धन्यः पिटनासा च मध्यमः ।

अधमो माटनासा च अश्रुनासाधमाधमः ॥

† अनन्तकविक्रतमुद्राराक्षसपूर्वपीठिका ।

— विविधाद्भुतगुणगणबह्वरीमूलकन्दो निखिलजननयनानन्दो जगद्धिदिन-  
सुधन्वाभिधो नन्दो राजा बभूव । तस्य च सकलसीमन्तिनी सीमन्तरत्नं रत्नावली नाम  
महिषी बभूव । तस्य च उदग्रधन्व-तीक्ष्णधन्व-विकटधन्व-उत्कटधन्व-प्रकटधन्व-सङ्कटधन्व-  
विषमधन्व-शिखरधन्व-प्रखरधन्वाभिधाना नवद्वीपाधिपतय इव नवोद्यद्दिन्दुसुन्दराशिरायुषो  
नव स्तनवः समजायन् ।

I know not what it was in the Ariano-Páli, but, seeing that one of a doubled consonant is frequently elided in modern vernaculars, I am disposed to think that such was also the case in ancient times in the Ariano-Páli. If this be admissible, the *amogha-bhati* of the coin may be accepted to mean “he of unflinching faith”. Such an epithet for a person who has been careful enough to delineate half-a-dozen different symbols of his religion on his coins, would by no means be inappropriate or questionable, and I have no hesitation in adopting it as the right one. We have here only an ancient version of the “Gháziuddín” of the Pathán coins of India, and the “Defender of the Faith” of the modern English currency.

According to these remarks the legend and its translation would stand thus—

Legend—*Rájnah Kunandasa amogha-bhatisa mahárájasa.*

Translation—Of the great king, king Kunanda, of unflinching faith.



Mr. Thomas identifies the sovereign named in the coin with the Xandrames of the Greek writers and the Nandas of the Purāṇas, and this would carry the age of the coin to some years before 317 B. C., when Chandragupta wrested the sovereignty of Magadha from the Nandas. There are several weak links in the chain of reasoning by which Mr. Thomas establishes this identity, but on the whole it is very plausible, and I am not in a position now to suggest anything better.

P. S. Since writing the above I have learnt that in the *Parás'ara Sañhiṭa*, *Kuninda* is used as the name of a tribe, and *Kauninda* that of its country.

